

REMARKS

Please reconsider the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering the present application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1, 3-4 were pending in the present application. Claim 1 is independent, while claims 3-4 are dependent from claim 1. By way of this reply, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the plurality of semiconductor light emitting devices are substantially aligned by aligning their one sides at an end thereof with a predetermined straight line. This amendment is fully supported by the original specification. No new matter has been added.

Rejection(s) Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1 of the present application stands rejected under U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,032,960 ("Kato") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,032,960 ("Matsumoto"). Claim 1 has been amended by way of this reply. To the extent that the rejection still applies, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 requires, in part, "a plurality of semiconductor light emitting devices that are substantially aligned by aligning their one sides at an end thereof with a predetermined straight line." This is clearly shown, in an exemplary embodiment of a light source unit as disclosed, for example, in figures 2, 3, 10, and 13 of the present specification. Applicant also notes that the optical component shown in figures 2, 3, and 10 is a lens and in figures 12 and 13 is a reflector. As can be seen in the exemplary embodiment, the plurality of

semiconductor light emitting devices are substantially aligned by aligning their one side at the end thereof with a predetermined straight line. Because of this, the optical component has a focus on the predetermined straight line. That is, the optical component has a focus on the side at the end of the array of light emitting devices.

Advantageously, in an optical system with an optical component having a focus on the side at the end of the array of the light emitting devices, a lens can form a clear cut line in a light distribution pattern based on light emitted from the portion of the light emitting devices near the sides at the end thereof aligned with the predetermined straight line. In such a case, the lens can project a clear boundary between a bright and a dark region that corresponds to the predetermined straight line.

To the contrary, in the light source device disclosed by Katoh, the optical component (which is *only* a lens 34) has a focus on the centerline of the array of light emitting devices. (See figures 5 and 9B.) Thus, the boundary, or cut line, is fuzzy because the focus of the optical component is away from the end of the light emitting devices. Accordingly, unlike the claimed invention, the optical component disclosed in Katoh cannot form a clear cut line due to the focus of the optical component in Katoh being on the centerline of the array of the light emitting devices. Thus, Katoh fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention as now recited in amended claim 1.

Matsumoto also fails to teach the claimed invention or supply that which Katoh lacks. Matsumoto merely discloses a method of regulating optical axes of headlights for an automotive vehicle so that a light intensity boundary of headlight low beam lies within a predetermined range. Matsumoto is completely silent as to “a plurality of semiconductor light

emitting devices that are substantially aligned by aligning their one sides at an end thereof with a predetermined straight line” as now required by claim 1.


In view of the above, Katoh and Matsumoto, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the claimed invention as now recited in amended claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Katoh and Matsumoto. Claims 3-4 depend from claim 1 and, therefore, are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account No. 50-0591, under Order No. 02008/148001 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated:

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas K. Scherer
Registration No.: 45,079
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)